

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner held that four separate inventions classified as Species A, B, C and D were presented in the application with none of claims 27-38 being generic. The Examiner stated that Species A was shown in Figure 5, Species B was shown in Figure 6, Species C was shown in Figure 7 and Species D was shown in Figure 8. The Examiner required an election of one of the foregoing species along with an identification of claims reading on the elected species. Applicant respectfully traverses the election requirement.

In the specification, under the section entitled "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS" on page 3, line 18, Figure 7 is described as being "a section view taken along line 7-7 of Fig. 6." Since Figure 7 shows the same thing as Figure 6, just from a different viewpoint, Species B and C must necessarily be the same thing. Applicant thus believes Species B and C to be the same invention.

Applicant elects to restrict the Application to that invention identified as Species B. Applicant believes claims 31-36 read on this species and elects those claims. Please cancel claims 27-30 and 37-38 without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute all claims in continuation or divisional applications. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and examination of this application based on the remaining claims and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/617,913
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2006

This response is timely filed within the statutory time period.

Respectfully submitted,

KEISLING PIEPER & SCOTT PLC


Trent C. Keisling, Reg. No. 36,565
1 East Center Street, Suite 217
Fayetteville, AR 72701
Attorneys for Applicant

Date:

9/25/2006

Tel: 479-251-0800
Fax: 479-251-0801